arXiv:1405.0151v1 [math-ph] 1 May 2014

On the collapse of a wave function satisfying a damped driven non-linear Schrödinger equation

Sigurd Assing

Department of Statistics
University of Warwick
e-mail: s.assing@warwick.ac.uk

Astrid Hilbert

Department of Mathematics
Linnéuniversitetet Vaxjo
e-mail: astrid.hilbert@lnu.se

Abstract: We show that a physically motivated trial solution of a damped driven non-linear Schrödinger equation does neither encounter collapse nor so-called pseudocollapse although the exponent of the non-linearity is critical. This result sheds new light on the accuracy of numerical solutions to this problem obtained in an earlier paper where the authors claim pseudocollapse of the trial solution when the variance of the driving noise is below a certain level.

Primary 60H10,81Q05; secondary 37L45.
Keywords and phrases: 2nd-order stochastic differential equation, time-change, Schrödinger equation, Lyapunov function, invariant control set.

1. Motivation and Results

We consider the equation

$$\mathbf{i}\,\partial_t\psi + \Delta_u\psi + |\psi|^2\psi - \Lambda\psi\,\partial_t(|\psi|^2) + \sigma(u,t)\psi \;=\; 0 \tag{1.1}$$

with Cauchy data at $t = 0$ where $[\sigma(u,t),\ (u,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0,\infty)]$ is radially symmetric centred Gaussian noise with covariance

$$\langle \sigma(u,t)\sigma(u',t')\rangle \;=\; \frac{D_r}{|u|}\,\delta_0(|u|-|u'|)\delta_0(t-t')$$

and the multiplication $\sigma(u,t)\psi$ is understood in Stratonovich's sense. This equation was derived in [3] as the isotropic continuum approximation of a model for two-dimensional damped driven exciton-phonon systems.

Note that (1.1), as derived in Section II of [3], is actually driven by coloured multiplicative noise. But, in Section III of [3], the authors say they would rather approximate the driving noise by space-time white noise which they had justified in [2]. Finally, in order to allow radially symmetric (i.e. isotropic) solutions, they

simplified space-time white noise to radially symmetric Gaussian noise as used in the formulation of (1.1)—the reader is referred to [2] for the definition of a parameter D_{white} which can be used to choose a physically meaningful value for D_r. The definition, in physical terms, of the positive damping parameter Λ can be found in [3].

In the case of $\Lambda = D_r = 0$, equation (1.1) is identical to the classical focusing (power) non-linear Schrödinger equation and the power *two* in the non-linearity $|\psi|^2\psi$ just gives the smallest power-like non-linearity for which blow-up occurs in space dimension $d = 2$.

For example, the wave function

$$\psi(u,t) \;=\; |t|^{-\frac{d}{2}} Q(\frac{u}{t})\, e^{-\mathbf{i}\frac{|u|^2}{4t} + \mathbf{i}/t} \tag{1.2}$$

where Q is the unique radially symmetric solution of

$$\Delta Q - Q + Q^{1+\frac{4}{d}} \;=\; 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^d \quad \text{with} \quad Q(u) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad |u| \to \infty$$

can be viewed as a solution of

$$\mathbf{i}\,\partial_t\psi + \Delta_u\psi + |\psi|^{\frac{4}{d}}\psi \;=\; 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^d \times (-1,\infty)$$

with Cauchy data

$$\psi(u,-1) \;=\; Q(u)\, e^{\mathbf{i}(\frac{|u|^2}{4}-1)} \quad \text{at} \quad t = -1$$

which blows up at time $t = 0$. Note that Q is also called *ground state*.

Now observe that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\psi(u,t)|^2\,\mathrm{d}u \;=\; \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Q(u)^2\,\mathrm{d}u$$

for all $t \in [-1,0)$ in the above example. Hence all L^2 - mass is accumulated into blow-up and, by the shape of Q, this accumulated L^2 - mass is concentrated at $u = 0$ at time $t = 0$.

The above described phenomenon, also called the L^2 - concentration phenomenon, is well-known for L^2 - critical Schrödinger equations—the reader is referred to [11],[12],[13] for general results.

In physical terms, the blow-up with L^2 - concentration of a wave function means that this wave function collapses into a point of physical space and the authors of [3] were interested in such a behaviour of wave functions satisfying their model for damped driven exciton-phonon coupled systems. So, using an arbitrary but smooth rapidly decreasing function $f : \mathbb{R} \to [0,\infty)$ and an unknown stochastic process $x = [x(t),\, t \geq 0]$, they introduced the trial function

$$\psi(u,t) \;\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}\; \frac{const}{x(t)}\, f(\frac{|u|}{x(t)})\, e^{\mathbf{i}\frac{\dot{x}(t)|u|^2}{4x(t)}}, \tag{1.3}$$

and argued, applying physical principles and formal calculations, that if ψ solves (1.1) then the process x would have to satisfy the following formal second order stochastic differential equation

$$\ddot{x} \;=\; \frac{\delta}{x^3} - \frac{\gamma \dot{x}}{x^4} + \sqrt{2D}\,\frac{\dot{W}}{x^2} \tag{1.4}$$

where $W = [W(t),\, t \geq 0]$ stands for a standard one-dimensional Wiener process and the multiplication $x^{-2}\dot{W}$ is understood in Stratonovich's sense.

Remark 1.1.

(i) The function f in the definition of the trial function plays the role of the ground state Q in definition (1.2) of the collapsing wave function. Note that f, in contrast to Q, does not have to satisfy any equation—the equation part is rather imposed on the unknown process x. This process x plays the role of the width of the trial wave function.

(ii) By simple calculation, the L^2 - mass

$$\|\psi(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2}^2 \;=\; \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\psi(u,t)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}u \;=\; 2\pi \cdot const^2 \int_0^\infty r f(r)^2 \,\mathrm{d}r$$

is conserved for all times t before a possible blow-up hence

$$const \;=\; \frac{\|\psi(\cdot,0)\|_{L^2}}{\sqrt{c_f^{1,2,0}}} \quad (\text{using } c_f^{m,n,p} \overset{\text{def}}{=} 2\pi \textstyle\int_0^\infty r^m [f(r)]^n [f'(r)]^p \,\mathrm{d}r)$$

depends on the initial Cauchy data of (1.1) and the choice of f. The same applies to the parameters

$$\delta \;=\; \frac{4}{c_f^{3,2,0}} \,(c_f^{1,0,2} - \frac{\|\psi(\cdot,0)\|_{L^2}^2 \, c_f^{1,4,0}}{2c_f^{1,2,0}})$$

and

$$\gamma \;=\; 8\Lambda \|\psi(\cdot,0)\|_{L^2}^2 \, c_f^{3,2,2}/(c_f^{1,2,0} c_f^{3,2,0}),\; D \;=\; 32\pi^2 D_r \, c_f^{3,2,2}/(c_f^{3,2,0})^2$$

as stated in ([3]).

(iii) Taking into account the above item (ii) and assuming existence and uniqueness of solutions to (1.4), the trial function has four degrees of freedom given by $x(0)$, $\dot{x}(0)$, $\|\psi(\cdot,0)\|_{L^2}$, f. Since (1.1) is considered a Cauchy problem with physical meaning, one should choose $x(0) > 0$. Then, a necessary condition for the trial function's blow-up would be that the process x reaches zero in finite time.

(iv) Recall the blow-up solution of the classical non-linear Schrödinger equation

$$\mathbf{i}\,\partial_t \psi + \Delta_u \psi + |\psi|^{\frac{4}{d}} \psi \;=\; 0 \quad \text{with} \quad \psi(\cdot,0) \in H^1 = \{\psi : \nabla\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)\}$$

given by (1.2) which satisfies $\|\psi(\cdot,0)\|_{L^2} = \|Q\|_{L^2}$ and compare with Weinstein's criterion [14, Thm. A] which says that solutions to the above classical non-linear Schrödinger equation would never blow-up if $\|\psi(\cdot,0)\|_{L^2} < \|Q\|_{L^2}$. So, in this situation, Weinstein's criterion is kind of sharp and there are regions in the admissible set of initial data which allow for global solutions. The same could apply to the more complex equation (1.1) which means that one has to study (1.4) for all possible choices of the parameters δ, γ, D as they all depend on $\|\psi(\cdot,0)\|_{L^2}$ or on f, the analogon to Q. Note that γ and D should be positive by item (ii) above.

Let us identify (1.4) with the degenerated diffusion equation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}x &= y\,\mathrm{d}t \\ \mathrm{d}y &= [\frac{\delta}{x^3} - \gamma\frac{y}{x^4}]\,\mathrm{d}t + \frac{\sqrt{2D}}{x^2} \circ \mathrm{d}W \end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

where '$\circ$' refers to Statonovich integration. Note that when (1.4) is understood in this sense then there is no difference between Stratonovich and Itô integration because x is of finite variation.

First we discuss the existence of weak solutions.

Theorem 1.2. *Let* $\mathbf{m}$ *be an arbitrary probability measure on* $(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}^2))$ *such that* $\mathbf{m}((0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}) = 1$. *Then there exists a pair* $[(x(t), y(t),\, t \geq 0]$ *of continuous* $\mathbb{F}$*-adapted processes and an* $\mathbb{F}$*-Wiener-process* W *on a filtered probability space* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbf{P})$ *such that* $(x(0), y(0)) \sim \mathbf{m}$ *and*

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &> 0, \\ x(t) &= x(0) + \int_0^t y(s)\,\mathrm{d}s, \\ y(t) &= y(0) + \delta\int_0^t \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{x(s)^3} - \gamma\int_0^t \frac{y(s)\,\mathrm{d}s}{x(s)^4} + \sqrt{2D}\int_0^t \frac{\mathrm{d}W(s)}{x(s)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \geq 0$, $\mathbf{P}$*-a.s.*

The proof of this existence result is based on the following lemma.

Lemma 1.3. *Consider the product*

$$\Omega_+ = \Omega_- \otimes C([0,\infty)), \quad \mathcal{F}_+ = \mathcal{F}_- \otimes \mathcal{B}(C([0,\infty))), \quad \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{P}_- \otimes \mathbf{P}_W$$

of a probability space $(\Omega_-, \mathcal{F}_-, \mathbf{P}_-)$ *and the standard Wiener space* $(C([0,\infty)), \mathcal{B}(C([0,\infty))), \mathbf{P}_W)$, *and let* (x_-, y_-) *be a pair of random variables on* $(\Omega_-, \mathcal{F}_-, \mathbf{P}_-)$ *satisfying* $\mathbf{P}_-(\{x_- > 0\}) = 1$. *Extend all random variables on either* $(\Omega_-, \mathcal{F}_-, \mathbf{P}_-)$ *or* $(C([0,\infty)), \mathcal{B}(C([0,\infty))), \mathbf{P}_W)$ *to* $(\Omega_+, \mathcal{F}_+, \mathbf{Q})$ *in the canonical way without changing their notation.*

Then there exists a probability measure $\mathbf{P}_+$ *on* $(\Omega_+, \mathcal{F}_+)$, *a filtration* $\mathbb{F}_+ = [\mathcal{F}_t^+,\, t \geq 0]$ *of sub-*σ*-algebras of* $\mathcal{F}_+$, *a pair* $[x_+(t), y_+(t),\, t \geq 0]$ *of continuous* $\mathbb{F}_+$*-adapted processes and an* $\mathbb{F}_+$*-Wiener-process* W_+ *such that*

$$\mathbf{P}_+ = \mathbf{Q} \text{ on } \mathcal{F}_0^+,$$

and

$$\left.\begin{aligned} x_+(t) &> 0, \\ x_+(t) &= x_- + \int_0^t y_+(s)\,\mathrm{d}s, \\ y_+(t) &= y_- + \delta \int_0^t \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{x_+(s)^3} - \gamma \int_0^t \frac{y_+(s)\,\mathrm{d}s}{x_+(s)^4} + \sqrt{2D} \int_0^t \frac{\mathrm{d}W_+(s)}{x_+(s)^2}, \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{1.6}$$

for all $t \in [0,1]$, $\mathbf{P}_+$*-a.s.*

The above results yield the existence of global weak solutions taking values in $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$ which, by standard arguments, can be extended to strong existence and uniqueness as the equation's coefficients are locally Lipschitz on $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$:

Corollary 1.4. *Equation (1.5) has a unique global strong solution on the open half-space* $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$.

This solution is of course associated with a Markovian transition semigroup, denoted by $[P_t,\, t \geq 0]$, in what follows. Furthermore, when adapting the proofs of Theorem 1.2 and Lemma 1.3 to initial conditions supported in $(-\infty,0)\times\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{P}_-(\{x_- < 0\}) = 1$, respectively, we find that solutions to (1.5) starting from $(x(0), y(0))$ with $x(0) < 0$ cannot reach $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$, that is:

Corollary 1.5. *Equation (1.5) has a unique global strong solution on the open half-space* $(-\infty,0)\times\mathbb{R}$.

Remark 1.6.

(i) The authors of [3] did not prove existence and uniqueness of solutions to (1.4)—they rather analysed numerical solutions of (1.4) in order to understand whether trajectories of numerical solutions could reach zero in finite time for different choices of the parameters δ, γ, D.

(ii) They concluded that solutions of (1.4) should not reach zero in finite time but that instead, at least for certain choices of δ, γ, D, solutions would exponentially decay to zero—see [3] for the details. As a consequence they would not expect a collapse of the trial wave function given by (1.3) but, for certain choices of δ, γ, D, a so-called pseudocollapse of it when its width exponentially decays.

In our paper we are going to show that there is no exponential decay to zero of the solution to (1.4) for any of the parameters δ, γ, D. As a consequence we would not expect any type of pseudocollapse of the trial wave function given by (1.3) which means that one would have to use a different trial function in order to capture blow-up behaviour of solutions to (1.1).

Note that this contradicts the numerical results mentioned in Remark 1.6(ii) above. We therefore think that the numerical techniques applied in [3] were not powerful enough to achieve the necessary accuracy when tackling stochastic differential equations of type (1.4) and it would be of interest to test other numerical methods and to redo the work carried out in [3, Section IV].

Our argument against exponential decay of the width of the trial wave function is based on the observation that the Markovian transition semigroup $[P_t,\, t \geq 0]$ has a unique invariant measure with smooth density with respect to Lebesgue measure. If such a measure exists then it would play the role of a unique ergodic state for the system (1.5) on $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$. Hence, as this ergodic state has a smooth density with respect to Lebesgue measure, the sytem's x-component cannot decay to the single point zero and numerical solutions should not show such behaviour.

Remark 1.7. For the ergodic theory applied above one needs that the dynamical system associated with $[P_t,\, t \geq 0]$ is continuous and this follows in our case—see [4, Chapter 2] for the details—from the property

$$\lim_{t\downarrow 0} P_t f(\xi,\eta) \;=\; f(\xi,\eta)$$

being satisfied for all bounded continuous functions on $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$ and all $(\xi,\eta)\in(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$. But this property holds indeed true because the solutions constructed in the proof of Theorem 1.2 are continuous in time.

To prove existence of an invariant measure, we transform (1.5) into

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}\xi(t) &= -\xi(t)^4\eta(t)\,\mathrm{d}t \\ \mathrm{d}\eta(t) &= \Big(\,\delta\,\xi(t) + 2\xi(t)^3\eta(t)^2 - \gamma\,\xi(t)^4\eta(t)\,\Big)\,\mathrm{d}t + \sqrt{2D}\,\mathrm{d}W(t) \end{aligned} \tag{1.7}$$

using the new coordinates

$$\xi = \frac{1}{x} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta = x^2 y.$$

The formal infinitesimal operator associated with equation (1.7) is given by

$$\mathcal{L} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\xi^4\eta\,\partial_\xi + (\delta\xi + 2\xi^3\eta^2 - \gamma\xi^4\eta)\partial_\eta + D\partial_\eta^2,$$

hence

$$\mathcal{L}f_L(\xi,\eta) \;=\; \delta\xi\eta - \gamma\xi^8\eta^2 + D\xi^4 \quad \text{for} \quad f_L(\xi,\eta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2}\,\xi^4\eta^2.$$

Obviously,

$$f_L : \mathbb{R}^2 \to [0,\infty), \qquad \lim_{(\xi,\eta)\to\infty} f_L(\xi,\eta) \;=\; \infty, \quad \mathcal{L}f_L \;\leq\; const\,(f_L + 1), \tag{1.8}$$

and the coefficients of $\mathcal{L}$ are locally Lipschitz so that, by standard theory, equation (1.7) has a unique global strong solution on $\mathbb{R}^2$. Furthermore the Markovian transition semigroup associated with this solution, denoted by $[\Pi_t,\, t \geq 0]$, in what follows, is *Feller* in the sense that it preserves the space of bounded continuous functions—see [9] for a good account on the underlying theory.

Next, we explain in more detail the connection between (1.5) and (1.7). Denote by $\mathbf{G}_1$ and $\mathbf{G}_2$ the transformations

$$\mathbf{G}_1 : (0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R} \to (0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{G}_2 : (-\infty,0)\times\mathbb{R} \to (-\infty,0)\times\mathbb{R}$$

both defined by $\mathbf{G}_i(x,y) = (x^{-1}, x^2 y)$, $i = 1, 2$, respectively. Note that both transformations are C^∞ and self-inverting (i.e. $\mathbf{G}_i = \mathbf{G}_i \circ \mathbf{G}_i$). Hence, by Itô's formula and Corollaries 1.4 + 1.5, for a given Wiener process $(W, \mathbb{F})$ on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbf{P})$, the pair of processes $[x(t), y(t),\, t \geq 0]$ is a solution of (1.5) starting from $(x(0), y(0))$ with $x(0) \neq 0$ if and only if $[\xi(t), \eta(t),\, t \geq 0]$ is a solution of (1.7) starting from $(1/x(0), x(0)^2 y(0))$ and solutions of (1.7) starting from values in $(0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ and $(-\infty, 0) \times \mathbb{R}$ stay in $(0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ and $(-\infty, 0) \times \mathbb{R}$, respectively. Focusing on the case of $(0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$, we therefore obtain:

Corollary 1.8.

(i) If $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is the restriction to $((0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}, \mathscr{B}((0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}))$ of an invariant measure of the Markovian transition semigroup $[\Pi_t,\, t \geq 0]$ which, in addition, satisfies $\boldsymbol{\mu}((0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}) = 1$, then the push forward measure $\mathbf{G}_1(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is an invariant measure of the Markovian transition semigroup $[P_t,\, t \geq 0]$. Furthermore, if $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ has a smooth density with respect to Lebesgue measure then the push forward measure $\mathbf{G}_1(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ has one, too.

(ii) A measure $\mathbf{m}$ on $((0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}, \mathscr{B}((0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}))$ is an invariant measure of the Markovian transition semigroup $[P_t,\, t \geq 0]$ if and only if the push forward measure $\mathbf{G}_1(\mathbf{m})$ is the restriction to $((0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}, \mathscr{B}((0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}))$ of an invariant measure of the Markovian transition semigroup $[\Pi_t,\, t \geq 0]$.

Now, we emphasise that, in addition to (1.8), the function f_L also satisfies

$$\lim_{(\xi,\eta)\to\infty} \mathcal{L} f_L(\xi, \eta) \;=\; -\infty$$

which makes it a proper Lyapunov function [5] for the purpose of constructing an invariant measure via Krylov-Bogolyubov [10]. Therefore, as it satisfies the Feller property, the Markovian transition semigroup $[\Pi_t,\, t \geq 0]$ possesses at least one invariant measure.

Remark 1.9.

(i) We could only find a Lyapunov function for $\mathcal{L}$ but not for the infinitesimal operator associated with equation (1.5) and that's why we introduced the system (1.7).

(ii) Since solutions of (1.7) starting from values in $(0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ stay in $(0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$, the above Krylov-Bogolyubov construction even gives existence of an invariant measure whose support is included in $\overline{(0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}}$.

(iii) One cannot straight away construct solutions to (1.5) by applying $\mathbf{G}_1$ to solutions of (1.7). In order to do so one would need to know that solutions of (1.7) starting from values in $(0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ stay in $(0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ which was shown by applying Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 1.10. *The Markovian transition semigroup $[\Pi_t,\, t \geq 0]$ has exactly one invariant measure $\boldsymbol{\mu}_+$ which satisfies $\boldsymbol{\mu}_+((0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}) = 1$. This measure $\boldsymbol{\mu}_+$ has a density with respect to Lebesgue measure and this density is smooth on $(0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$.*

So, when taking $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ to be the restriction to $((0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}, \mathscr{B}((0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}))$ of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_+$ and applying Corollary 1.8, the above theorem immediately implies the final corollary below which was our key argument on page 6 against exponential decay of the width of the trial wave function given by (1.3).

Corollary 1.11. *The Markovian transition semigroup $[P_t,\, t\geq 0]$ has a unique invariant measure with smooth density with respect to Lebesgue measure.*

2. Proofs

Proof of Lemma 1.3. Denote by $[B_t,\, t\geq 0]$ the coordinate process on $(C([0,\infty)), \mathcal{B}(C([0,\infty))), \mathbf{P}_W)$ and define the filtration

$$\mathbb{G}_+ \,=\, [\mathcal{G}_t^+,\, t\geq 0] \quad \text{by} \quad \mathcal{G}_t^+ \,=\, [\,\mathcal{F}_-\otimes\{\emptyset, C([0,\infty))\}\,]\vee\sigma(\{B_s : s\leq t\}).$$

Note that $[B_t,\, t\geq 0]$ is a $\mathbb{G}_+$-Wiener-process on $(\Omega_+,\mathcal{F}_+,\mathbf{Q})$.

Of course,

$$\hat{y}(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e^{-\gamma t}y_- + \sqrt{2D}\int_0^t e^{-\gamma(t-s)}\,\mathrm{d}B_s, \quad t\geq 0,$$

satisfies

$$\hat{y}(t) \,=\, y_- - \gamma\int_0^t \hat{y}(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + \sqrt{2D}\,B_t, \quad t\geq 0,\ \mathbf{Q}\text{-a.s.} \tag{2.1}$$

Next

$$\hat{x}(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big[\, x_-^{-3} - 3\int_0^t \hat{y}(s)\,\mathrm{d}s\,\Big]^{-1/3}$$

solves

$$\hat{x}(t) \,=\, x_- \,+\int_0^t \hat{x}(s)^4\,\hat{y}(s)\,\mathrm{d}y \quad \text{for} \quad t<\tau\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}\inf\{s\geq 0 : \int_0^s \hat{y}(r)\,\mathrm{d}r = x_-^{-3}/3\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Remark 2.1. The $\mathbb{G}_+$-stopping time τ satisfies $\mathbf{Q}(\{\tau<\infty\})=1$. To see this rewrite (2.1) to obtain $\int_0^s \hat{y}(r)\,\mathrm{d}r = y_-/\gamma - \hat{y}(s)/\gamma + \sqrt{2D}B_s/\gamma$, for all $s\geq 0$, $\mathbf{Q}$-a.s., where

$$-\hat{y}(s) + \sqrt{2D}B_s \,=\, -e^{-\gamma s}y_- + \sqrt{2D}\int_0^s [1-e^{-\gamma(s-r)}]\,\mathrm{d}B_r$$

using the definition of $\hat{y}(s)$. But the integral on the above right-hand side, when considered a process in s, is recurrent with respect to any open neighbourhood of $x_-^{-3}/3 - y_-/\gamma$, proving the claim.

Now introduce $[T_t,\, t\geq 0]$ defined by

$$T_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \int_0^t \hat{x}(s)^4\,\mathrm{d}s & : \quad t<\tau, \\ +\infty & : \quad t\geq\tau, \end{cases}$$

which gives an increasing right-continuous $\mathbb{G}_+$-adapted process.

Lemma 2.2.

$$\lim_{t\uparrow\tau} T_t \;=\; +\infty \quad \mathbf{Q}\text{-}a.s.$$

Proof. There exists $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{F}_+$ such that $\mathbf{Q}(\Omega_0) = 1$ and both $\hat{y}(s,\omega)$ is continuous in s as well as $\tau(\omega) < \infty$ for all $\omega \in \Omega_0$. Choose $\omega \in \Omega_0$ and assume that

$$\lim_{t\uparrow\tau(\omega)} T_t(\omega) \;=\; c \;<\; +\infty.$$

Then, for $t < \tau(\omega)$, it follows from the mean value theorem that

$$c \,-\, T_t(\omega) \;=\; (\tau(\omega) - t)\,\Big[\; x_-^{-3} - 3\int_0^{\tilde{t}} \hat{y}(s,\omega)\,\mathrm{d}s \;\Big]^{-4/3}$$

where $\tilde{t} \in (t, \tau(\omega))$. But, by definition of τ and continuity of $\hat{y}(s,\omega)$ in s,

$$x_-^{-3} - 3\int_0^{\tilde{t}} \hat{y}(s,\omega)\,\mathrm{d}s \;=\; 3(\tau(\omega) - \tilde{t}\,)\;\hat{y}\Big(\tilde{\tilde{t}}, \omega\Big)$$

for some $\tilde{\tilde{t}} \in (\,\tilde{t}, \tau(\omega))$, again applying the mean value theorem. Thus

$$c \,-\, T_t(\omega) \;=\; O\left((\tau(\omega) - t)^{-\frac{1}{3}}\right), \quad t \uparrow \tau(\omega),$$

which is a contradiction, proving $\lim_{t\uparrow\tau(\omega)} T_t(\omega) = +\infty$ for all $\omega \in \Omega_0$. □

As $[T_t,\, t \geq 0]$ is continuous and strictly increasing on $[0,\tau)$, Lemma 2.2 implies that the right-inverse $A = [A_t,\, t \geq 0]$ defined by

$$A_t \;=\; \inf\{s \geq 0 : T_s > t\}$$

is a continuous strictly increasing family of $\mathbb{G}_+$-stopping times satisfying

$$A_t \;<\; \tau, \quad t \geq 0,\, \mathbf{Q}\text{-a.s.}$$

As a consequence, the time-changed processes $x_+(t) = \hat{x}(A_t)$, $y_+(t) = \hat{y}(A_t)$ are well-defined for all $t \geq 0$ on a set in $\mathcal{F}_+$ of $\mathbf{Q}$-measure one. Furthermore, by time-change, equation (2.2) yields

$$x_+(t) \;=\; x_- \;+\; \int_0^t y_+(s)\,\mathrm{d}s, \quad t \geq 0,\, \mathbf{Q}\text{-a.s.} \tag{2.3}$$

Remark 2.3. It follows immediately from the construction of $\hat{x}$ on $[0,\tau)$ that $x_+(t) > 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, $\mathbf{Q}$-a.s.

So, the first two statements of the lemma would be true under the measure $\mathbf{Q}$. But, the last statement—the equation for $y_+(t)$—requires a measure $\mathbf{P}_+$ different to $\mathbf{Q}$. The next step is to construct this measure.

Introduce the process $\rho = [\rho(t),\, t \geq 0]$ given by

$$\rho(t) \;\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}\; \exp\{\delta\sqrt{2D}\int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{[0,A_1]}(s)\hat{x}(s)\,\mathrm{d}B_s - \delta^2 D\int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{[0,A_1]}(s)\hat{x}(s)^2\,\mathrm{d}s\}$$

which is well-defined since the stochastic integrand is a caglad $\mathbb{G}_+$-adapted process. Observe that

$$\int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{[0,A_1]}(s)\hat{x}(s)^2\,\mathrm{d}s \;\le\; \sqrt{t}\cdot\sqrt{\int_0^{A_1}\hat{x}(s)^4\,\mathrm{d}s} \;=\; \sqrt{t}\cdot\sqrt{T_{A_1}} \;=\; \sqrt{t},$$

and hence

$$\int \exp\{\delta^2 D\int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{[0,A_1]}(s)\hat{x}(s)^2\,\mathrm{d}s\}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{Q} \;<\; \infty,$$

for all $t\ge 0$, so that ρ is a $\mathbb{G}_+$-martingale by Novikov's condition.

Copying the proof of Corollary 5.2 in [8], one can construct a probability measure $\mathbf{P}_+$ on $\mathcal{G}_\infty^+$ such that

$$\hat{W}_+(t) \;\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}\; B_t \;-\delta\int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{[0,A_1]}(s)\hat{x}(s)\,\mathrm{d}s/\sqrt{2D},\quad t\ge 0,$$

is a $\mathbb{G}_+$-Wiener-process.

Remark 2.4. (i) The measure constructed in the original proof of Corollary 5.2 in [8] would be defined on $\sigma(\{B_s : s\ge 0\})$ but our integrand $\mathbf{1}_{[0,A_1]}\hat{x}(\cdot)$ is not $\sigma(\{B_s : s\ge 0\})$-measurable. However, the proof still works when using $\mathcal{G}_\infty^+$ instead. It is not needed that $\mathbb{G}_+$ satisfies the usual conditions.

(ii) Obviously, the σ-algebra $\mathcal{G}_\infty^+$ coincides with $\mathcal{F}_+$.

The measure $\mathbf{P}_+$ does not have to be absolutely continuous w.r.t. $\mathbf{Q}$ but it is on every $\mathcal{G}_t^+$ where $\mathbf{P}_+ = \rho(t)\cdot\mathbf{Q}$. This allows to carry over $\mathbf{Q}$-a.s. events to $\mathbf{P}_+$-a.s. events by approximation with monotone sequences of events. For example, by Remark 2.3,

$$\mathbf{Q}(\{x_+(t)>0 \text{ for all } t<T_{N\wedge\tau}\}) \;=\; 1$$

where

$$\{x_+(t)>0 \text{ for all } t<T_{N\wedge\tau}\}\in\mathcal{G}_N^+$$

and

$$\{x_+(t)>0 \text{ for all } t<T_{(N+1)\wedge\tau}\}\subseteq\{x_+(t)>0 \text{ for all } t<T_{N\wedge\tau}\},$$

for all $N=1,2,\ldots$, so that

$$\mathbf{P}_+(\{x_+(t)>0 \text{ for all } t\ge 0\}) \;=\; \lim_{N\uparrow\infty}\mathbf{P}_+(\{x_+(t)>0 \text{ for all } t<T_{N\wedge\tau}\}) \;=\; 1.$$

Similarly, equation (2.3) also holds $\mathbf{P}_+$-a.s., and (2.1) can be written as

$$\hat{y}(t) \;=\; y_- \;+\;\delta\int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{[0,A_1]}(s)\hat{x}(s)\,\mathrm{d}s - \gamma\int_0^t \hat{y}(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + \sqrt{2D}\,\hat{W}_+(t),$$

for all $t\ge 0$, $\mathbf{P}_+$-a.s., which gives

$$y_+(t) \;=\; y_- \;+\;\delta\int_0^t \frac{\mathbf{1}_{[0,A_1]}(A_s)}{x_+(s)^3}\,\mathrm{d}s - \gamma\int_0^t \frac{y_+(s)}{x_+(s)^4}\,\mathrm{d}s + \sqrt{2D}\,\hat{W}_+(A_t) \qquad (2.4)$$

since

$$A_t \;=\; \int_0^{A_t} \hat{x}(s)^{-4}\,\mathrm{d}T_s \;=\; \int_0^t x_+(s)^{-4}\,\mathrm{d}s,$$

for all $t \geq 0$, $\mathbf{P}_+$-a.s.

Now, let $\mathbb{F}_+$ be the time-changed filtration given by $\mathcal{F}_t^+ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{G}_{A_t}^+$, $t \geq 0$, so that

$$\mathbf{P}_+ = \mathbf{Q} \quad \text{on} \quad \mathcal{F}_0^+ \;=\; \mathcal{G}_0^+$$

because $\rho(0) = 1$. Also, note that $[x_+(t), y_+(t),\, t \geq 0]$ are $\mathbb{F}_+$-adapted processes which are both $\mathbf{P}_+$-a.s. continuous.

Furthermore, the process $M_+(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \hat{W}_+(A_t)$, $t \geq 0$, is a continuous local $\mathbb{F}_+$-martingale with quadratic variation $\langle M_+ \rangle = A$. Since, $\mathbf{P}_+$-a.s., this quadratic variation takes the form $\int_0^t x_+(s)^{-4}\,\mathrm{d}s$, $t \geq 0$, where the integrand $x_+(s)^{-4}$, $s \geq 0$, is positive and continuous, Theorem II.7.1 in [7] implies that there is an $\mathbb{F}_+$-Wiener-process W_+ on $(\Omega_+, \mathcal{F}_+, \mathbf{P}_+)$ such that

$$M_+(t) \;=\; \hat{W}_+(A_t) \;=\; \int_0^t \frac{\mathrm{d}W_+(s)}{x_+(s)^2}, \quad t \geq 0,\, \mathbf{P}_+\text{-a.s.}$$

Hence (2.4) translates into

$$y_+(t) \;=\; y_- \;+\; \delta \int_0^t \frac{\mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}(s)}{x_+(s)^3}\,\mathrm{d}s - \gamma \int_0^t \frac{y_+(s)}{x_+(s)^4}\,\mathrm{d}s + \sqrt{2D} \int_0^t \frac{\mathrm{d}W_+(s)}{x_+(s)^2}, \quad (2.5)$$

for all $t \geq 0$, $\mathbf{P}_+$-a.s., finally proving the lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Set $\Omega_- = \mathbb{R}^2$, $\mathcal{F}_- = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $\mathbf{P}_- = \mathbf{m}$ and let (x_-, y_-) be the random variable on $(\Omega_-, \mathcal{F}_-, \mathbf{P}_-)$ induced by the identity on $\mathbb{R}^2$. Observe that $\mathbf{P}_-(\{x_- > 0\}) = 1$ is an immediate consequence of $\mathbf{m}((0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}) = 1$.

Hence, there is a tupel $(\Omega_+, \mathcal{F}_+, \mathbb{F}_+, \mathbf{P}_+, [x_+(t), y_+(t), W_+(t),\, t \geq 0])$ the components of which satisfy the properties stated in the conclusion of Lemma 1.3. Moreover, using $\mathrm{d}x_+(t) = y_+(t)\,\mathrm{d}t$ and (2.5) when multiplying $x_+(t)^2$ by $y_+(t)$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{2D}W_+(t) \;&=\; x_+(t)^2 y_+(t) - x_-^2 y_- - 2\int_0^t x_+(s) y_+(s)^2\,\mathrm{d}s \\ &-\; \delta \int_0^t \frac{\mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}\,\mathrm{d}s}{x_+(s)} + \gamma \int_0^t \frac{y_+(s)\,\mathrm{d}s}{x_+(s)^2}\,, \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

for all $t \geq 0$, $\mathbf{P}_+$-a.s., and hence one can also consider W_+ a Wiener process with respect to the filtration obtained by $\mathbf{P}_+$-augmentation of $\sigma(\{(x_+(s), y_+(s)) : s \leq t\})$, $t \geq 0$.

The next step is to construct, by induction, a sequence $(\Omega_n, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathbb{F}_n, \mathbf{P}_n, [x_n(t), y_n(t), W_n(t),\, t \geq 0])$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, such that

$$\left.\begin{aligned} x_n(t) \;&>\; 0, \\ x_n(t) \;&=\; x_n(0) + \int_0^t y_n(s)\,\mathrm{d}s, \\ y_n(t) \;&=\; y_n(0) + \delta \int_0^t \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{x_n(s)^3} - \gamma \int_0^t \frac{y_n(s)\,\mathrm{d}s}{x_n(s)^4} + \sqrt{2D} \int_0^t \frac{\mathrm{d}W_n(s)}{x_n(s)^2}\,, \end{aligned}\right\} \quad (2.7)$$

for all $t \in [0,n]$, $\mathbf{P}_n$-a.s., where $[x_n(t), y_n(t), W_n(t),\ t \geq 0]$ are continuous $\mathbb{F}_n$-adapted processes of which W_n is an $\mathbb{F}_n$-Wiener process, and $(x_n(0), y_n(0)) \sim \mathbf{m}$.

Observe that the tupel $(\Omega_+, \mathcal{F}_+, \mathbb{F}_+, \mathbf{P}_+, [x_+(t),\ y_+(t), W_+(t),\ t \geq 0])$ found in the first part of the proof plays the role of the initial case $n = 1$, of course.

So, fix $n \geq 2$ and suppose that $(\Omega_{n-1}, \mathcal{F}_{n-1}, \mathbb{F}_{n-1}, \mathbf{P}_{n-1}, [x_{n-1}(t),\ y_{n-1}(t),\ W_{n-1}(t),\ t \geq 0])$ has already been constructed. By the argument following (2.6), we also assume that W_{n-1} is a Wiener process with respect to the filtration obtained by $\mathbf{P}_{n-1}$-augmentation of $\sigma(\{(x_{n-1}(s), y_{n-1}(s)) : s \leq t\})$, $t \geq 0$.

Reset $\Omega_- = \Omega_{n-1}$, $\mathcal{F}_- = \mathcal{F}_{n-1}$, $\mathbf{P}_- = \mathbf{P}_{n-1}$ and choose $x_- = x_{n-1}(n-1)$, $y_- = y_{n-1}(n-1)$. Then, again by Lemma 1.3, there is a corresponding tupel $(\Omega_+, \mathcal{F}_+, \mathbb{F}_+, \mathbf{P}_+,\ [x_+(t),\ y_+(t), W_+(t),\ t \geq 0])$ which we now denote by $(\Omega_n, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathbb{F}_+, \mathbf{P}_n, [x_+(t),\ y_+(t), W_+(t),\ t \geq 0])$. Recall that $[x_{n-1}(t), y_{n-1}(t), W_{n-1}(t),\ t \geq 0]$ are extended to $(\Omega_n, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathbf{P}_n)$ in the canonical way without changing their notation. Define, for $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} x_n(t) &= x_{n-1}(t \wedge (n-1)) + x_+((t-n+1) \vee 0) - x_{n-1}(n-1), \\ y_n(t) &= y_{n-1}(t \wedge (n-1)) + y_+((t-n+1) \vee 0) - y_{n-1}(n-1), \\ W_n(t) &= W_{n-1}(t \wedge (n-1)) + W_+((t-n+1) \vee 0), \end{aligned}$$

and build the filtration $\mathbb{F}_n$ from both $\mathbb{F}_{n-1}$ and $\mathbb{F}_+$ by

$$\mathcal{F}_t^n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \mathcal{F}_t^{n-1} \otimes \{\emptyset,\, C([0,\infty))\} & : \quad t < n-1, \\ \mathcal{F}_{t-n+1}^+ & : \quad t \geq n-1. \end{cases}$$

All in all, because of

$$\mathbf{P}_n \,=\, \mathbf{P}_+ \,=\, \mathbf{Q} \,=\, \mathbf{P}_- \otimes \mathbf{P}_W \,=\, \mathbf{P}_{n-1} \otimes \mathbf{P}_W \quad \text{on} \quad \mathcal{F}_0^+$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}_{n-1} \otimes \{\emptyset,\, C([0,\infty))\} \,=\, \mathcal{F}_- \otimes \{\emptyset,\, C([0,\infty))\} \,\subseteq\, \mathcal{F}_0^+,$$

we can easily conclude that the above construction yields the wanted tupel $(\Omega_n, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathbb{F}_n, \mathbf{P}_n, [x_n(t),\ y_n(t), W_n(t),\ t \geq 0])$ satisfying (2.7).

Note that, as a consequence of (2.5), we also have

$$y_n(t) \,=\, y_n(0) + \delta \int_0^t \frac{\mathbf{1}_{[0,n]}\, \mathrm{d}s}{x_n(s)^3} - \gamma \int_0^t \frac{y_n(s)\, \mathrm{d}s}{x_n(s)^4} + \sqrt{2D} \int_0^t \frac{\mathrm{d}W_n(s)}{x_n(s)^2},$$

for all $t \geq 0$, $\mathbf{P}_n$-a.s., leading to the nth-step analogue of (2.6), that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{2D} W_n(t) &= x_n(t)^2 y_n(t) - x_n(0)^2 y_n(0) - 2 \int_0^t x_n(s) y_n(s)^2\, \mathrm{d}s \\ &- \delta \int_0^t \frac{\mathbf{1}_{[0,n]}\, \mathrm{d}s}{x_n(s)} + \gamma \int_0^t \frac{y_n(s)\, \mathrm{d}s}{x_n(s)^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

for all $t \geq 0$, $\mathbf{P}_n$-a.s., so that W_n can also be considered a Wiener process with respect to the filtration obtained by $\mathbf{P}_n$-augmentation of $\sigma(\{(x_n(s), y_n(s)) : s \leq t\})$, $t \geq 0$.

The next step of the proof consists in constructing a measure on $((\mathbb{R}^2)^{[0,\infty)}, \mathcal{B}((\mathbb{R}^2)^{[0,\infty)}))$ whose finite-dimensional distributions are induced by the laws of the two-dimensional processes $[x_n(t),\, y_n(t),\, t \geq 0]$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, in the following way.

For an arbitrary finite sequence of non-negative mutually different numbers $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \ldots, t_k)$ define

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{t}}(\Gamma) \,=\, \mathbf{P}_n(\overbrace{\{(x_n(t_1), y_n(t_1), \ldots, x_n(t_k), y_n(t_k)) \in \Gamma\}}^{\textit{cylinder set}}), \quad \Gamma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{2k}),$$

where n is the smallest integer such that $n \geq \max\{t_1, \ldots, t_k\}$. Then $\{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{t}}\}$ is a consistent family of finite-dimensional distributions in the sense of Kolmogorov. Hence there is a probability measure $\mathbf{P}$ on $((\mathbb{R}^2)^{[0,\infty)}, \mathcal{B}((\mathbb{R}^2)^{[0,\infty)}))$ satisfying

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{t}}(\Gamma) \,=\, \mathbf{P}(\{(x(t_1), y(t_1), \ldots, x(t_k), y(t_k)) \in \Gamma\}), \quad \Gamma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{2k}),$$

where $[x(t),\, y(t),\, t \geq 0]$ denotes the coordinate process on $\Omega = (\mathbb{R}^2)^{[0,\infty)}$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the completion of $\mathcal{B}((\mathbb{R}^2)^{[0,\infty)})$ with respect to $\mathbf{P}$, and let $\mathbb{F}$ be the filtration obtained by $\mathbf{P}$-augmentation of $\sigma(\{x(s),\, y(s) : s \leq t\})$, $t \geq 0$.

Note that, almost surely, $[x(t),\, y(t),\, t \geq 0]$ is a pair of continuous $\mathbb{F}$-adapted processes. This is seen by two simple arguments. First, since[1]

$$\mathbf{P}_n(\{t \mapsto (x_n(t), y_n(t)) \text{ continuous on } [0, n]\}) \,=\, 1,$$

each of the events $\{t \mapsto (x(t), y(t)) \text{ continuous on } [0, n]\}$ is in $\mathcal{F}$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, and second,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{P}(\{t \mapsto (x(t), y(t)) \text{ continuous on } [0, n]\}) \\ =\, &\mathbf{P}_n(\{t \mapsto (x_n(t), y_n(t)) \text{ continuous on } [0, n]\}), \end{aligned}$$

for each $n \geq 1$.

In what follows, $[x(t),\, y(t),\, t \geq 0]$ always stands for a fixed continuous version indistinguishable of the coordinate process.

Of course, in a similar way, one shows that $(x(0), y(0)) \sim \mathbf{m}$, $x(t) > 0$ for $t \geq 0$, $\mathbf{P}$-a.s., as well as

$$x(t) \,=\, x(0) \,+ \int_0^t y(s)\, \mathrm{d}s, \quad t \geq 0, \, \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.} \tag{2.9}$$

Now introduce

$$\begin{aligned} W(t) \;&\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}\; \frac{x(t)^2 y(t) - x(0)^2 y(0)}{\sqrt{2D}} - 2\int_0^t \frac{x(s) y(s)^2}{\sqrt{2D}}\, \mathrm{d}s \\ &-\; \delta \int_0^t \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{\sqrt{2D}\, x(s)} + \gamma \int_0^t \frac{y(s)\, \mathrm{d}s}{\sqrt{2D}\, x(s)^2}, \quad t \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

[1] As this probability can be approximated by probabilities of cylinder sets.

and observe that this process is a Wiener process because, by (2.8), it satisfies

$$\mathbf{P}(\{(W(t_1),\dots,W(t_k))\in\Gamma\}) \;=\; \mathbf{P}_n(\{(W_n(t_1),\dots,W_n(t_k))\in\Gamma\}),$$

for every $\mathbf{t}=(t_1,\dots,t_k)$, $n\geq\max\{t_1,\dots,t_k\}$ and $\Gamma\in\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^k)$, and because the continuity of $[x(t),\,y(t),\,t\geq 0]$ makes it a continuous process. Furthermore, as W_n can be considered a Wiener process with respect to the filtration obtained by $\mathbf{P}_n$-augmentation of $\sigma(\{(x_n(s),y_n(s)):s\leq t\})$, $t\geq 0$, one can also consider W to be an $\mathbb{F}$-Wiener-process.

Finally, again using the corresponding property on $(\Omega_n,\mathcal{F}_n,\mathbf{P}_n)$, each of the processes $[y(t\wedge n),\,t\geq 0]$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-semimartingale, $n=1,2,\dots$, and hence $[y(t),\,t\geq 0]$ is one, too. As a consequence,

$$\sqrt{2D}\,W(t) \;=\; \int_0^t x(s)^2\,\mathrm{d}y(s)-\delta\int_0^t\frac{\mathrm{d}s}{x(s)}+\gamma\int_0^t\frac{y(s)\,\mathrm{d}s}{x(s)^2},\quad t\geq 0,\ \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

follows from (2.9) and the definition of $W(t)$ by partial integration. Thus, using the above right-hand side when calculating $\int_0^t x(s)^{-2}\,\mathrm{d}W(s)$ for any $t\geq 0$ eventually proves the theorem. □

Proof of Proposition 1.10. If not said otherwise, all measures discussed in this proof are defined on the topological measure space $(\mathbb{R}^2,\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}^2))$. Let's denote by '$\operatorname{supp}\boldsymbol{\mu}$' the support of such a measure $\boldsymbol{\mu}$.

Lemma 2.5. *If $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is an invariant measure of the Markovian transition semigroup $[\Pi_t,\,t\geq 0]$, then $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\{0\}\times\mathbb{R})=0$.*

Proof. First observe that any solution $[\xi(t),\,\eta(t),\,t\geq 0]$ to (1.7) starting from $(\xi(0),\eta(0))\in\{0\}\times\mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$\xi(t)\;=\;0,\quad \eta(t)\;=\;\eta(0)+\sqrt{2D}\,W(t),\quad t\geq 0,\text{ a.s.},$$

so that solutions to (1.7) starting from values in $\{0\}\times\mathbb{R}$ stay in $\{0\}\times\mathbb{R}$. Recall the paragraph before Corollary 1.8 on page 7 where it is stated that solutions of (1.7) starting from values in $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$ and $(-\infty,0)\times\mathbb{R}$ stay in $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$ and $(-\infty,0)\times\mathbb{R}$, respectively.

Hence, if $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is an invariant measure of $[\Pi_t,\,t\geq 0]$, then, for any bounded measurable function $\phi:\mathbb{R}^2\to\mathbb{R}^2$ satisfying $\phi=\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{0\}\times\mathbb{R}}$, we have

$$\int_{\{0\}\times\mathbb{R}}\phi\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\mu}\;=\;\int_{\{0\}\times\mathbb{R}}\Pi_t\phi\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\mu}\;=\;\int_{\{0\}\times\mathbb{R}}\phi\,\mathrm{d}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0*[\delta_0\otimes N(0,2Dt)]),$$

for all $t\geq 0$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_0$ stands for the restriction to $\{0\}\times\mathbb{R}$ of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, δ_0 is the Dirac measure at zero on $(\mathbb{R},\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}))$, and $N(0,2Dt)$ denotes the centred Gaussian measure with variance $2Dt$. This implies $\boldsymbol{\mu}_0=\boldsymbol{\mu}_0*[\delta_0\otimes N(0,2Dt)]$, for all $t\geq 0$, which can only be true if $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\{0\}\times\mathbb{R})=0$. □

By combining the above lemma and Remark 1.9(ii), the Markovian transition semigroup Π_t, $t \geq 0$, must have an extremal invariant measure $\boldsymbol{\mu}_+$ satisfying

$$\operatorname{supp} \boldsymbol{\mu}_+ \cap \Big[\, (0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R} \, \Big] \neq \emptyset. \tag{2.10}$$

We are going to show that there is only one measure of this type and that this measure has all properties claimed in Theorem 1.10.

Our proof is based on two standard arguments for this purpose which need to be verified:

- $(0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ is an invariant control set for (1.7);
- the (formal) adjoint $\mathcal{L}^\star$ is hypoelliptic as a PDE operator on $(0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$.

While showing the former requires more effort the latter can easily be verified by checking Hörmanders bracket condition.

Let us first introduce the notion of an invariant control set. This notion relates to the control problem

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}z_1(t) &= -z_1(t)^4 z_2(t)\,\mathrm{d}t \\ \mathrm{d}z_2(t) &= \Big(\delta\, z_1(t) + 2z_1(t)^3 z_2(t)^2 - \gamma\, z_1(t)^4 z_2(t) \Big)\,\mathrm{d}t + \sqrt{2D}\, u(t)\,\mathrm{d}t \end{aligned}$$

associated with (1.7) where we restrict ourselves to smooth admissible controls $u : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$. For fixed $(\xi,\eta) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, introduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}(T,\xi,\eta) &= \{(z_1,z_2) : \text{there exists a solution to the above control problem} \\ &\qquad \text{starting from } (\xi,\eta) \text{ such that } z_1 = z_1(T) \text{ and } z_2 = z_2(T)\}, \end{aligned}$$

and define

$$\mathcal{O}(\xi,\eta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{T>0} \mathcal{O}(T,\xi,\eta).$$

Definition 2.6. A set $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is called *invariant control set for (1.7)* if

$$\bar{\mathcal{C}} = \overline{\mathcal{O}(\xi,\eta)} \quad \text{for all} \quad (\xi,\eta) \in \mathcal{C},$$

and $\mathcal{C}$ is maximal with respect to inclusion.

Now, by [1, Prop.1.1], if $\boldsymbol{\mu}_+$ is an extremal invariant measure then there exists an invariant control set $\mathcal{C}$ such that

$$\operatorname{supp} \boldsymbol{\mu}_+ = \bar{\mathcal{C}}.$$

So, if $(0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ is an invariant control set then any extremal invariant measure $\boldsymbol{\mu}_+$ satisfying (2.10) would even satisfy

$$\operatorname{supp} \boldsymbol{\mu}_+ = \overline{(0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}},$$

and, by Lemma 2.5,

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_+((0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}) = 1.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\mu}_+$ be such an extremal invariant measure. Then $\boldsymbol{\mu}_+((-\infty,0]\times\mathbb{R}) = 0$, and hence the restriction of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_+$ to $((-\infty,0]\times\mathbb{R}, \mathscr{B}((-\infty,0]\times\mathbb{R}))$ has a density with respect to Lebesgue measure. But $\mathcal{L}^\star\boldsymbol{\mu}_+ = 0$ so that, if $\mathcal{L}^\star$ is besides hypoelliptic as a PDE operator on $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$, then the restriction of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_+$ to $((0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}, \mathscr{B}((0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}))$ even has a smooth density with respect to Lebesgue measure. Furthermore, it is well-known that an extremal invariant measure is unique on its invariant control set if there it has a continuous density with respect to Lebesgue measure—see the proof of Proposition 2.1 in [1], for example.

All in all, the two arguments

- $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$ is an invariant control set for (1.7) and
- the (formal) adjoint $\mathcal{L}^\star$ is hypoelliptic as a PDE operator on $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$

indeed imply that the invariant measure $\boldsymbol{\mu}_+$ satisfying (2.10) has all properties claimed in Theorem 1.10.

It remains to be shown that the above two arguments hold true.

First, we deal with the hypoellipticity. Define

$$X_0(\xi,\eta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\xi^4\eta\,\partial_\xi + (\delta\xi + 2\xi^3\eta^2 - \gamma\xi^4\eta)\partial_\eta, \quad X_1(\xi,\eta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \partial_\eta,$$

and interpret X_0, X_1 as smooth vector fields on the smooth manifold $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$. Observe that $\mathcal{L}$, when considered a PDE operator on $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$, takes the 'Hörmander-form' of

$$\mathcal{L} \;=\; X_0 + D\,X_1^2,$$

and that

$$[X_0, X_1] \;=\; \xi^4\,\partial_\xi - (4\xi^3\eta - \gamma\xi^4)\partial_\eta.$$

Hence, the two vector fields X_1 and $[X_0, X_1]$ span the whole tangent space at any point in $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$ so that, by Hörmander's theorem [6], both $\mathcal{L}$ and its (formal) adjoint $\mathcal{L}^\star$, when considered PDE operators on $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$, are hypoelliptic.

Finally, we verify that $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$ is an invariant control set finishing the proof of the theorem. First, the maximality required in Definition 2.6 is clear because solutions to (1.7) starting from values in $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$ stay in $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$. So, for $\mathcal{C} = (0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$, we need to show that

$$\bar{\mathcal{C}} \;=\; \overline{\mathcal{O}(\xi,\eta)} \quad \text{for all} \quad (\xi,\eta)\in\mathcal{C}$$

which is a consequence of Lemma 2.7 below. □

Lemma 2.7. *For any pair $(\xi,\eta),(z_1,z_2)\in(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$, there exists a smooth control $u:[0,1]\to\mathbb{R}$ such that the deterministic differential equation*

$$\begin{aligned} \tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}z_1(t) &= -z_1(t)^4 z_2(t) \\ \tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}z_2(t) &= \Big(\,\delta\, z_1(t) + 2z_1(t)^3 z_2(t)^2 - \gamma\, z_1(t)^4 z_2(t)\,\Big) + u(t) \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

has a solution on $[0,1]$ subject to $z_1(0)=\xi$, $z_2(0)=\eta$, $z_1(1)=z_1$, $z_2(1)=z_2$, and $z_1(t)>0$, $t\in[0,1]$.

Proof. Observe that the first equation of the system (2.11) can be written as

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}[z_1(t)^{-3}] \,=\, 3z_2(t).$$

Choose a polynomial $p : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ whose restriction to $[0,1]$ is going to play the role of $z_1(t)^{-3}$, that is, choose p such that

$$p(0) = \xi^{-3}, \quad p(1) = z_1^{-3}, \quad p'(0) = 3\eta, \quad p'(1) = 3z_2,$$

and $p(t) > 0$, $t \in [0,1]$.

Then

$$u(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{3}\,p''(t) - \delta p(t)^{-1/3} - \frac{2}{9}\,p(t)^{-1}[p'(t)]^2 + \frac{\gamma}{3}\,p(t)^{-4/3}p'(t), \quad t \in [0,1],$$

is an admissible control for the system (2.11) when

$$z_1(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} p(t)^{-1/3} \quad \text{and} \quad z_2(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{3}\,p'(t),$$

for $t \in [0,1]$. □

Acknowledgement. Sigurd Assing would like to thank Martin Hairer for an idea of how to shorten the proof of Lemma 2.7, his original proof was much longer.

References

[1] Arnold, L. and Kliemann, W.: On unique ergodicity for degenerate diffusions. *Stochastics* **21**, (1987), no. 1, 41–61. MR-0899954

[2] Bang, O., Christiansen, P.L., Gaididei, Y.B., If, F., Rasmussen, K.O.: Temperature effects in a nonlinear model of monolayer Scheibe aggregates. *Physical Review E*, **49**, (1994), no. 5, 4627–4635.

[3] Christiansen, P.L., Gaididei, Y.B., Johansson, M., Rasmussen, K.O., Yakimenko, I.I.: Collapse of solitary excitations in the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with nonlinear damping and white noise. *Physical Review E*, **54**, (1996), no. 1, 924–930.

[4] Da Prato, G. and Zabczyk, J.: Ergodicity for infinite dimensional systems. London Mathematical Society lecture notes series **229**. *Cambridge University Press*, Cambridge, 1996. xi+339 pp. MR-1417491

[5] Has'minskii, R.Z.: Stochastic stability of differential equations. Translated from the Russian by D. Louvish. Monographs and Textbooks on Mechanics of Solids and Fluids: Mechanics and Analysis, **7**. *Sijthoff & Noordhoff*, Alphen aan den Rijn—Germantown, Md., 1980. xvi+344 pp. MR-0600653

[6] Hörmander, L.: Hypoelliptic second order differential equations. *Acta Math.* **119**, (1967), 147–171. MR-0222474

[7] Ikeda, N. and Watanabe, S.: Stochastic Differential Equations and Diffusion Processes. Second edition. North-Holland mathematical library **24**. *North-Holland Publishing*, Amsterdam, 1989. xiv+555 pp. MR-1011252

[8] Karatzas, I. and Shreve, E.: Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus. Second edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics **113**. *Springer Verlag*, New York, 1991. xxiv+470 pp. MR-1121940

[9] Kolokoltsov, V.N.: Nonlinear Markov processes and kinetic equations. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics **182**. *Cambridge University Press*, Cambridge, 2010. xviii+375 pp. MR-2680971

[10] Kryloff, N., Bogoliouboff, N.: La théorie générale de la mesure dans son application à l'étude des systèmes dynamiques de la mécanique non linéaire. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **38**, (1937), no. 1, 65–113. MR-1503326

[11] Merle, F.: Construction of solutions with exactly k blow-up points for the Schrödinger equation with critical nonlinearity. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **129**, (1990), no. 2, 223–240. MR-1048692

[12] Merle, F., Tsutsumi, Y.: L^2-concentration of blow up solutions for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with critical power nonlinearity. *J. Diff. Eq.* **84**, (1990), 205–214. MR-1047566

[13] Nawa, H.: Asymptotic and limiting profiles of blowup solutions of the nonlinear Schrödinger Equation with critical power. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **52**, (1999), no. 2, 193–270. MR-1653454

[14] Weinstein, M.I.: Nonlinear Schrödinger equations and sharp interpolation estimates. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **87**, (1983), 567–576. MR-0691044